

Keiichi KITAHARA et al., Application No. 10/594,255  
Page 6

Dkt. 5048/76889

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-16 are pending and presented for reconsideration, with claim 4, 6 and 7 having previously been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant submits that the term "*coating solution for anti-ultraviolet layer*" as used in the application refers to the composition before curing, and the term "*anti-ultraviolet layer*" as used in the application refers to the composition after curing. The Examiner is respectfully referred to the paragraph at page 13, lines 9-16 (reproduced below) of the present application.

On one surface of a polyethylene terephthalate film having a b\* value of 1.0 and a thickness of 188  $\mu\text{m}$  as a transparent plastic film, a *coating solution for anti-ultraviolet layer* having the following composition was applied, dried, and irradiated with ultraviolet rays by using a high pressure mercury lamp to *form an anti-ultraviolet layer* having a thickness of 4  $\mu\text{m}$  and thus prepare a surface protective sheet of Example 1.

Therefore, the discussion in the application of the ultraviolet absorber, microparticles and organopolysiloxane in the anti-ultraviolet layer would be construed to refer to after curing (as opposed to discussion of elements in the coating solution for anti-ultraviolet layer).

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Onozawa et al. (US 6,103,370) in view of Nakamura et al. (US 2002/0085284 A1) and further in view of Ciba® TINUVIN® 328 product literature, Ciba® CHIMASSORB®

Keiichi KITAHARA et al., Application No. 10/594,255  
Page 7

Dkt. 5048/76889

81 product literature and Ciba® TINUVIN® 1130 product literature (collectively "Ciba product literature"). Claims 1, 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over McMan et al. (US 2004/0241469 A1) in view of Onozawa and Nakamura.

The present application includes the aspects of (a) the ultraviolet absorber is an absorber having a formula weight of 200 to 400 (claim 1), (b) the content of the ultraviolet absorber is 5 to 15 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the ionizing radiation curable resin composition following curing (claim 1), (c) the anti-ultraviolet layer comprises spherical microparticles having a mean particle diameter of 1 to 20  $\mu\text{m}$  (claim 1), and (d) the thickness of the anti-ultraviolet layer is 20 to 80% of the mean particle diameter of the microparticles (claims 3 and 5).

As discussed in paragraphs [0023], [0027], [0029] and [0032], each of the aforementioned aspects (a) through (d) contributes to reduce yellow tint of the anti-ultraviolet layer. See also Examples 1-4 of the present application.

It is contended in the Office Action that Onozawa (US 6,103,370) and McMan (US 2004/0241469A1) disclose aspect (b).

However, none of the cited references disclose or suggest at all that aspect (b) leads to the excellent effect of reducing the yellow tint.

Further, Onozawa and McMan do not disclose or suggest aspects (a), (c) and (d).

It is contended in the Office Action that Nakamura (US 2002/0085284 A1) discloses aspects (c) and (d). However, Nakamura does NOT disclose or suggest aspect (a).

Further, neither Nakamura nor any of the other cited references disclose or suggest at all that aspects (c) and (d) lead to the excellent effect of reducing the yellow tint.

Likewise, none of the cited references, including Ciba product literature, disclose or

APR 02 2010

Keiichi KITAHARA et al., Application No. 10/594,255  
Page 8

Dkt. 5048/76889

suggest at all that aspect (a) leads to the excellent effect of reducing the yellow tint.

In short, one skilled in the art, without the benefit of the present application as a roadmap, would not find it obvious that the combination of elements from the cited references would have yielded the excellent effect of reducing the yellow tint, which is certainly an unexpected result, that is clearly indicative of unobviousness of the claimed subject matter of the present application.

Further, applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the elements from the cited references in the manner suggested in the Office Action.

Applicant submits that since the cited art, even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, does *NOT* render unpatentable the aforementioned aspects (a) through (c) of the present application, independent claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable over the cited art.

Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any required fees, and to credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837  
Attorney for Applicant  
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400